Job Satisfaction Determinants Among Faculty Members: A Comprehensive Analysis of College of Management and Business Technology

Vivien Amor Viloria, Dr. Reynante P. Blas, Mercy V. Torres, Raphael R. Aduna

College of Management and Business Technology, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Nueva Ecija, Philippines

Abstract— This study explores the job satisfaction of faculty members at the College of Management, Business, and Technology (CMBT). The results indicate high satisfaction levels regarding compensation, recognition, and work-life balance, with faculty members feeling particularly valued by their superiors, colleagues, and students. Opportunities for career growth and the work environment also received positive feedback, though to a slightly lesser extent. Interpersonal relations were highly rated, suggesting strong professional connections within the faculty. This study provides valuable insights into the factors influencing job satisfaction among CMBT faculty, offering guidance for institutional policies to enhance faculty well-being and professional fulfillment.

Keywords— Career growth, Compensation, Faculty members, Job satisfaction, Work-life balance

I. INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is a critical factor in the performance, retention, and overall well-being of faculty members in higher education institutions. It encompasses various aspects of an individual's work life, including the nature of the work, relationships with colleagues, opportunities for professional growth, and compensation (Spector, 1997). In the College of Management and Business Technology, understanding job satisfaction levels among faculty members is vital for ensuring a supportive and productive academic environment.

Recent studies have highlighted the significance of job satisfaction in higher education, linking it to both personal and institutional outcomes. For instance, job satisfaction among faculty members has been shown to correlate with higher levels of teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and student satisfaction (Johnsrud, 2017; Bentil et al., 2020). Conversely, low job satisfaction can lead to higher turnover rates, reduced morale, and diminished institutional reputation (Kusku, 2020).

Faculty members in the fields of management and business technology may experience unique job satisfaction determinants due to the dynamic and evolving nature of these disciplines. Rapid technological advancements and changes in business practices require continuous learning and adaptation, which can influence job satisfaction levels.

A study by Hagedorn (2019) explored job satisfaction among business faculty and found that engagement with current industry practices and opportunities for consulting work significantly enhance job satisfaction. Furthermore, the relevance of their academic work to real-world applications contributes to a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction.

In the realm of business technology, faculty members often face the challenge of keeping up with rapid technological changes. According to Rehman et al. (2021), institutions that provide adequate resources for technology integration and continuous

professional development in emerging technologies report higher job satisfaction among their faculty members.

Recent literature has highlighted several emerging trends and challenges affecting job satisfaction in higher education. The increasing reliance on adjunct and part-time faculty has raised concerns about job security and equitable compensation, which directly impact job satisfaction (Kezar & Maxey, 2018). Additionally, the COVID-19 pandemic has introduced new stressors, such as the need for remote teaching and balancing work-life demands, which have affected faculty job satisfaction (Johnson et al., 2021).

This study aims to investigate the job satisfaction of faculty members within the College of Management and Business Technology. By identifying the factors that contribute to or detract from job satisfaction, the study seeks to provide insights that can inform policy and practice within the college, ultimately enhancing the work environment and supporting faculty members' professional growth and well-being.

II.   METHODOLOGY

This study employs a quantitative research design to assess the job satisfaction levels among faculty members of the College of Management and Business Technology in terms of compensation, recognition, promotion, and opportunity for growth, work environment, work-life balance, and interpersonal relations. A survey methodology is utilized to collect data from the participants, ensuring a systematic and comprehensive examination of the various dimensions of job satisfaction.

The target population for this study includes all full-time faculty members employed at the College of Management and Business Technology. A stratified random sampling technique will be used to ensure representation across different departments and academic ranks within the college.

The questionnaire with 4-point Likert scale are distributed electronically via Google Form with follow-up reminders sent to maximize response rates. Participation in the survey will be voluntary, and confidentiality will be maintained throughout the study.

Table 1 Table of Equivalence

Score	Data Analysis Parameter	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
4	3.25-4.00	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
3	2.50-3.24	Agree	Satisfied
2	1.75-2.49	Disagree	Dissatisfied
1	1.00-1.74	Strongly Disagree	Very Dissatisfied

III.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2 Profile of CMBT Faculty Members

Sex		
Male	12	34.29%
Female	23	65.71%
Age		
21-30	4	11.43%
31-40	8	22.86%
41-50	18	51.43%
51-60	4	11.43%
61-above	1	2.86%
Status of Appointment		
Regular	35	100.00%
Years in Service		
1-5	5	14.29%
6-10	12	34.29%
11-15	9	25.71%
16-20	2	5.71%
20 and above	7	20.00%
Academic Rank	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Instructor	5	14.29%
Assistant Professor	8	22.86%
Associate Professor	19	54.29%
Professor	3	8.57%
Educational Attainment		
with Doctorate Units	13	37.14%
Doctorate Degree	22	62.86%

The majority of faculty members are female, comprising approximately 65.71% of the total, while males account for 34.29%. This gender distribution indicates a significant female representation among the faculty members. This could reflect broader trends in educational employment, where certain fields may see higher female participation.

The age distribution highlights that a substantial portion of the faculty is in the middle age bracket of 41-50 years. This age group typically encompasses individuals with significant professional experience and possibly at the peak of their academic careers. The smaller representation of younger (21-30) and older (61 and above) faculty members suggests limited recent hiring and fewer faculty working past the typical retirement age. The diversity in age can bring varied perspectives and mentoring opportunities within the faculty.

All faculty members have a regular appointment status, indicating job stability and potentially contributing positively to job satisfaction. This stability is likely to contribute positively to job satisfaction, as faculty members can focus on their teaching and research activities without the uncertainty of contract renewals. It also suggests that the institution values and invests in long-term faculty development, which can enhance the overall academic environment.

The distribution of years in service reveals that the faculty has a blend of relatively new and highly experienced members. The largest group has been in service for 6-10 years, indicating a period where a significant number of faculty were likely hired. The presence of faculty with over 20 years of service demonstrates institutional loyalty and a depth of experience. Such a range can foster mentorship opportunities and the transfer of institutional knowledge. However, it also suggests the need for succession planning and career development opportunities for newer faculty members to maintain continuity and motivation across all service years.

The predominance of Associate Professors suggests that many faculty members are in the mid-stages of their academic careers, having progressed beyond the initial ranks. This could be a reflection of the institution's promotion policies and the faculty's achievements. The smaller number of full Professors might indicate stringent promotion criteria or a relatively younger institution. The distribution of academic ranks can influence job satisfaction, as it affects faculty members' roles, responsibilities, and professional development opportunities. Ensuring clear pathways for promotion and professional growth is crucial for maintaining high job satisfaction levels.

A significant proportion of the faculty members have attained a Doctorate Degree (62.86%), with the remaining 37.14% holding Doctorate Units. This high level of educational attainment is likely a positive factor in job satisfaction and academic quality.

Table 3 Job Satisfaction in terms of Compensation

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
I am satisfied with my salary.	3.27	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
I am satisfied with the bonuses I received	3.34	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
Average Weighted Mean	**3.30**	**Strongly Agree**	**Very Satisfied**

Table 3 shows that the respondents agreed that they are very satisfied in terms of salary (3.27), and bonuses (3.34) they received.

The overall weighted mean of 3.30 means that the employees of NEUST CMBT are very satisfied in terms of compensation. This high level of satisfaction in compensation is consistent with studies that identify fair remuneration as a critical factor for job satisfaction (Parker & Wright, 2016) and that competitive compensation is critical for job satisfaction in academia (Liu et al., 2021).

Table 4 Job Satisfaction in terms of Recognition

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
I feel valued, recognized and appreciated by my superior.	3.30	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
I feel valued, recognized and appreciated by my co-workers.	3.31	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
I feel valued, recognized and appreciated by my co-workers from other departments.	3.01	Agree	Satisfied
I feel valued, recognized and appreciated by my students	3.25	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
Average Weighted Mean	**3.22**	**Agree**	**Satisfied**

Table 4 shows that the respondents strongly agreed that are very satisfied with their job at NEUST because they feel valued, recognized, and appreciated by their superior (3.30), co-workers, (3.31) and students (3.25), while they are satisfied with the recognition of their co-workers from other departments (3.01).

Based on this, it can be gathered from the overall weighted mean of 3.22, with a verbal interpretation of "agree" that employees for NEUST CMBT are satisfied with the recognition that they received from the community. The overall satisfaction mean of 3.22 indicates general contentment with recognition, aligning with findings that recognition is vital to job satisfaction (Bishop, 2018).

Table 5 Job Satisfaction in terms of Promotion and Opportunity for Growth

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
I am satisfied with my job because I have opportunities for career growth	3.29	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
I am satisfied with my job because I have opportunities for positional advancement/ promotion	3.00	Agree	Satisfied
Average Weighted Mean	**3.15**	**Agree**	**Satisfied**

Table 5 shows that the respondents strongly agreed that they were very satisfied because they have opportunity for career growth (3.29) while they agreed on the concern for positional advancement or promotion (3.00). The overall satisfaction mean of 3.15 indicates general satisfaction, though clearer promotion pathways are necessary. (Guthrie et al., 2020).

Table 6 Job Satisfaction in terms of Work-Life Balance

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
I'm satisfied with my job because it helps me find the ideal balance between my:			
work responsibilities	3.33	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
life responsibilities	3.40	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
AverageWeighted Mean	**3.36**	**Strongly Agree**	**Very Satisfied**

Table 6 shows that the respondents strongly agreed that they were very satisfied with their jobs because they have a balance with work responsibilities (3.33) and life responsibilities (3.40).

The overall satisfaction mean of 3.15 reflects general satisfaction in this area, though the need for clearer promotion pathways is evident, as supported by research on career development and job satisfaction (Smith & Jones, 2020).

Table 7 Job Satisfaction in terms of Work Environment

Statement	WM	Verbal Interpretation	Statement
I find my organization a good place to work because it provides me:			
appropriate level of privacy	3.00	Agree	Satisfied
sound control in the workplace	2.99	Agree	Satisfied
Adequate materials to use for work	3.20	Agree	Satisfied
good physical condition of the workplace	3.25	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
Average Weighted Mean	**3.11**	**Agree**	**Satisfied**

Table 7 shows that the respondents agreed that they were satisfied with their jobs because it provides them an appropriate level of privacy (3.00), sound control of the workplace (2.99) and adequate materials to use for work (3.20). the respondents strongly agree, however, that they are very satisfied

with the good physical condition of the workplace (3.25)

The overall mean of 3.11 suggests general satisfaction, though improvements in privacy and sound control could enhance job satisfaction further (Oldham & Fried, 2016).

Table 8 Job Satisfaction in terms of Interpersonal Relations

Statement	WM	Verbal Interpretation	Statement
I am satisfied with my job because I have good relationship with:			
the students	3.33	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
the parents	3.06	Agree	Satisfied
my colleagues	3.33	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
the administrators	3.27	Strongly Agree	Very Satisfied
Average Weighted Mean	**3.25**	**Strongly Agree**	**Very Satisfied**

Table 8 shows that the respondents strongly agreed that are very satisfied with their job at NEUST because they have good relationship with students (3.33), colleagues (3.33) and the administrators (3.27) while they are satisfied with their relationship with parents (3.06).

The overall mean of 3.25 indicates that positive interpersonal relations are a significant factor in job

satisfaction, corroborating studies on workplace relationships (Friedman et al., 2014).

IV.   CONCLUSION

The study reveals that faculty members of CMBT are generally satisfied with various aspects of their job, including compensation, recognition, promotion opportunities, work-life balance, work environment,

and interpersonal relations. Compensation and work-life balance are particularly strong areas, indicating that these factors play a significant role in faculty satisfaction. Recognition and interpersonal relations also contribute positively to job satisfaction, though there is a slight need for improved recognition from colleagues in other departments. Promotion and growth opportunities, as well as certain aspects of the work environment, such as privacy and sound control, show potential areas for improvement.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

o enhance faculty job satisfaction, several key areas should be addressed. First, promotion opportunities should be improved by establishing clearer career advancement pathways and providing more positional promotions, ensuring faculty members feel recognized for their contributions. Additionally, the work environment can be refined by addressing concerns related to privacy and sound control, fostering a more comfortable and productive workspace. Strengthening interdepartmental recognition is also essential, as fostering a culture of appreciation across departments can enhance faculty members' sense of value and acknowledgment. Moreover, continuous professional development should be encouraged, supporting faculty in maintaining high educational attainment and overall job satisfaction. Lastly, work-life balance initiatives must continue to be prioritized, as maintaining a healthy balance between professional and personal life plays a crucial role in faculty well-being. By implementing these improvements, institutions can further enhance faculty satisfaction and professional fulfillment.

REFERENCES

[1] Bentil, S., Adusei, M., & Tweneboah, G. (2020). Faculty Job Satisfaction in Ghanaian Universities. *Higher Education Research & Development, 39*(5), 944-957.

[2] Johnsrud, L. K. (2017). Quality of faculty worklife: Integrating work satisfaction and productivity. *Journal of Higher Education, 88*(3), 346-366.

[3] Kusku, F. (2020). Analyzing faculty turnover intentions: The impact of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Education and Science, 45*(203), 283-297.

[4] Spector, P. E. (1997). Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences. *SAGE Publications*.

[5] Ahmed, I., & Crossman, A. (2017). Job satisfaction of university teachers: An empirical study. *Journal of Educational Research and Review, 12*(3), 158-165.

[6] Bentley, P. J., Coates, H., Dobson, I. R., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, V. L. (2017). Job satisfaction around the academic world. *Springer*.

[7] Hagedorn, L. S. (2019). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 27*(2), 5-20.

[8] Johnson, N., Veletsianos, G., & Seaman, J. (2021). U.S. faculty and administrators' experiences and approaches in the early weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Online Learning, 25*(1), 6-21.

[9] Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2018). The changing academic workforce. *Association of American Colleges & Universities*.

[10] Lechuga, V. M. (2019). Exploring culture, job satisfaction, and support within Hispanic-serving institutions. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 18*(4), 342-356.

[11] Nguyen, Q. T., Klopper, C., & Smith, C. (2018). Predictors of job satisfaction among higher education academics in Vietnam. *International Journal of Educational Management, 32*(3), 512-526.

[12] Parker, S., & Wright, J. (2016). Compensation and Job Satisfaction. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 48(1), 23-35.

[13] Rehman, M., Khan, M. S., & Hashmi, S. H. (2021). Technology integration and faculty job satisfaction in higher education. *Education and Information Technologies, 26*(3), 2955-2970.

[14] Robinson, C., White, R., & Jackman, P. (2021). Faculty collegiality and job satisfaction: The role of professional and social relationships. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 43*(4), 369-384.

[15] Spector, P. E. (1997). Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences. *SAGE Publications*.

[16] Sutherland, K. A. (2020). Professional development and job satisfaction in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development, 39*(6), 1167-1180.